

From: copwatch [copwatch@copwatch.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2003 1:31 PM
To: Laham, Michael S
Subject: Re: LOS ANGELES SHERIFF REFUSES TO INVESTIGATE AN APPARENT FORGERY

Michael-

Feel free to post your story (below) to the Database.

Incidentally, the viewable version of your original story is the one that is archived in the database. We are still ironing out some bugs in the database, so if the current version of your story is not the version you finalized, please retain your material and modify the entry.

Are you having any trouble accessing the Forum?

I wish that more people submitted complaints that were as meticulous and credible as yours. Great job.

Regards,

Mike

----- Original Message -----

From: "Laham, Michael S" <michael.s.laham@boeing.com>
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 08:50:22 -0700

>Dear Editors of Copwatch Web Site,

>

>We write to send you the story below in the hope that you will either post it on a Copwatch bulletin board or give us permission to post it on the Copwatch.org database. The story is about how the Los Angeles County Sheriff (LASD) refused to investigate an apparent forgery by a real estate company. It shows how, in our opinion, the LASD gives some people preferential treatment.

>

>If you choose to post the story on a Copwatch bulletin board, please note that we have condensed the story, whose text is shown below under the label "Text of Story:", to less than 4000 characters (3,946 bytes).

>

>We look forward to your reply and hope that you will post this story on a Copwatch bulletin board or give us permission to post it on the Copwatch.org database. And we are very grateful to you and to Copwatch for letting us post our earlier story about the police misconduct and malicious prosecution in Irvine, CA, on the Copwatch.org database.

>

>Sincerely,

>

>Michael and Elana Laham
>P. O. Box 5248
>Orange, CA 92863-5248
>E-mail: michael.s.laham@boeing.com

>

>

>Title of Story: LOS ANGELES SHERIFF REFUSES TO INVESTIGATE
AN APPARENT FORGERY

>

>Text of Story:

>

>During the RED HOT real estate market in 2002, we listed our home with Presidential Real Estate of Cerritos, CA, with selling agent Richard Feng. It sat unsold on the market for five months because we had problems with Presidential Real Estate.

>

>One problem was their attempt to lock us into a sale contract at a price below market. Finalizing this bad sale depended on Richard Feng acknowledging receipt of buyer's acceptance of Counter Offer #1 before its stated deadline, by initialing the counter offer. When we received a copy of Counter Offer #1, Richard Feng's initials appeared to have been forged. We showed the questionable initials of RF, with other examples of RF that we witnessed Richard Feng sign, to two highly qualified handwriting analysts, in whose opinion the initials RF on Counter Offer #1 were forged.

>

>Forgery is a crime, per CA Penal Code Section 470, so on 3/28/03 we went to file a criminal report at the Los Angeles Sheriff Department's (LASD) Cerritos Station. We spoke to Deputy Floan who asked about whom we wanted to complain. After we told him, he told us to speak to deputies Smith, Serrano, and Bastian, for whom we waited over two hours before they spoke to us. Deputy Smith told us we could not file a criminal complaint since we already sought civil redress. When we asked him what law says this, he did not know!

>

>On 4/1/03 Sgt. Robert McLin, badge #060704 of the LASD forgery and fraud detail, told us it was legal to file a criminal report, as it doesn't matter whether we file a criminal or civil complaint first.

>

>On 4/3/03 we addressed a complaint to Cpt. Ted S. Siara of the LASD Cerritos Station that we were refused our right to file a criminal complaint of forgery and that again we requested to file.

>

>On 4/7/03 Cpt. Siara told us that he would 1) investigate that his deputies failed to investigate a forgery within his jurisdiction and 2) coordinate an investigation of the forgery. Per his request, we addressed our forgery complaint to Lt. Gary De Cew on 4/15/03, along with the Counter Offer #1 document in question, exemplars of Richard Feng's initials, and conclusion statements of two handwriting experts.

>

>On 6/23/03 Cerritos Station Cpt. Michael R. McDermott's response that we were denied the right to file a forgery complaint was, "Our investigation revealed that the initial actions of Deputy Smith regarding this incident were reasonable and within established Department policy and guidelines."

>

>On 7/23/03 in a telephone conversation with Sgt. McLin, he told us that, "The person who did the forgery denies its a forgery", "There is no evidence of a crime", "I am not conducting an investigation", and "This matter is closed out and I refuse to write a letter to document the close-out of this case."

>

>On 7/29/03 and 8/6/03 we responded to Sgt. McLin that of course the person who did the forgery would deny it! How can he claim there is no evidence of a crime if 1) he never investigated and 2) the opinions of two HIGHLY qualified handwriting experts were that it was a forgery? J. Richard Nadeau helped capture the UNIBOMBER and published a book about handwriting analysis and he is Board Certified Document Examiner and American College of Forensic Examiners. W. A. Hatch was a police officer in the forgery detail under handwriting expert Harold Ely and he is also a court qualified handwriting comparison expert. To his refusal to investigate and that the matter is closed, we asked is that because the suspects are on the LASD's pretty people list? That he refused to document the close out of the case - is that because he has something to hide?

>

>As of date we have received NO response from ANYONE at LASD. We asked in our FAX dated 8/6/03 to Sheriff Leroy D. Baca, Cpt. McDermott and Sgt. McLin if they ever read the book Animal Farm? It's about how animals on a farm are given the rule by the pigs that LAWS ONLY APPLY TO SOME, NOT ALL.

>